

### REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated on May 31, 2007.

Claims 1, 25, and 36 are amended, no claims are canceled or added; as a result, claims 1, 3-11, 25-31, 36-42, and 62-64 are now pending in this application.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement and a 1449 Form on May 4, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests that initialed copies of the 1449 Forms be returned to Applicant's Representatives to indicate that the cited references have been considered by the Examiner.

#### §112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome this rejection. Applicant has also amended claims 25 and 36 in a similar manner. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the basis of this rejection.

#### §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-11, 25-31, 36-42 and 62-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Copperman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,585 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

#### Concerning claims 1, 25, and 36:

Applicant cannot find in the cited portions of Copperman any disclosure or description of "extracting from the retrieved set of one or more documents, at least one concept feature that appears in at least one document in the retrieved set of one or more documents," as currently recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 25 and 36. Instead, the cited portions of Copperman apparently describe a preparatory procedure used when documents are first

organized and stored in a retrieval system (*see* Copperman at col. 2, lines 13-31). In contrast, the process described in Applicant's claim 1 occurs after a user query has been received and a set of one or more documents have been retrieved based on the user query. There is, therefore, no discussion in Copperman of retrieving a set of documents based on a user query and of extracting at least one concept feature from the set of retrieved documents. Since all elements of claim 1 are not described in Copperman, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the basis of this rejection.

Moreover, Applicant cannot find in the cited portions of Copperman any disclosure or description of "using the at least one concept feature to determine, using a knowledge map, at least one matched concept that corresponds to the at least one concept feature," as currently recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 25 and 36. Instead, the cited portions of Copperman apparently describe an autocontextualization process, which is apparently used to parse, organize, and categorize documents as they are introduced into a retrieval system (*see generally* Copperman at col. 17, line 55 – col. 20, line 38). In contrast, the process described in Applicant's claim 1 occurs after a document corpus has been established and after a set of documents has been retrieved and analyzed based on a user query. Since all elements of claim 1 are not described in Copperman, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the basis of this rejection.

Concerning dependent claims 3-11, 26-31, 37-42, and 62-64:

Dependent claims 3-11, 26-31, 37-42, and 62-64 depend from claims 1, 25, or 36, either directly or indirectly, and incorporate the limitations of claims 1, 25, or 36, respectively. As such, these dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of its parent independent claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Thus, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of any basis of rejection of claims 3-11, 26-31, 37-42, and 62-64. For brevity, Applicant reserves the right to present further remarks concerning the patentable distinctiveness of such dependent claims.

---

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6909 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

MAX COPPERMAN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6909

Date Oct 1, 2007

By Thomas F. Brennan  
Thomas F. Brennan  
Reg. No. 35,075

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 1 day of October 2007.

USA Postage

Jina Rosorke

Name

Signature